

# The Brethren's Evangelist.

H. A. HOLSINGER & CO.,

"LEAVING THE PRINCIPLES OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST, LET US GO ON UNTO PERFECTION."

\$2.00 per Annum in Advance.

VOL. VI.

ASHLAND, O., WEDNESDAY, DEC. 3, 1884.

NO. 48.

## CUNEUS CUNEUM TRUDIT.

BY J. W. BEER.

My heading is a Latin sentence meaning, "One wedge drives another." Roberts reviews me, Miller sifts Roberts, and he in turn is sifted by Balsbaugh; and by these processes the original wheat is lost. I feel that it is now my turn to shake the sieve.

Brother Roberts' review was fair, but it was neither thorough nor satisfactory. He assumes that the offices named "were not established by Christ;" but I answer they are all included in 1 Cor. 12: 28. None but the gifts and offices extraordinary have passed away, and this still leaves teachers, helps, governments. Paul says that God set these in the church. It would be hard to prove that the Apostles acted without authority from the Head of the church. Brother R. attributes the counsel of "the twelve" to Paul (Acts 6: 2), and then adds that Paul "claims no high authority," which is another mistake. Paul's claim is this: "I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." (Gal. 1: 11, 12.) Again, "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." 1 Cor. 14: 37. No man ever claimed higher authority than Paul.

In answer to the question, "Are the same officers now necessary?" he says, "I would say, no." He then quotes my language, "Many of them have passed away." The quotation is correct, but it applies only to the extraordinary gifts and offices as having passed away. After referring to the abuses "of the old Dunkard church" in having "too many captains and too few privates in the ranks," he says, "I hope that of other mistakes these two may be utterly obliterated, namely, electing ministers and making delegates." I do not want to charge my very highly esteemed brother with rashness, but I cannot persuade myself to believe that he is in earnest. I can think of no quicker and surer way of obliterating the church, than to rob it of the power of choosing, selecting or "electing ministers and making delegates," or messengers. This is an inalienable right of the church; but woe to the minister or messenger who abuses his power or usurps authority. What is "a pastor chosen by as near unanimity as possible" but a minister elected by the church? What are deacons and trustees but delegates? Think again, my brother, while I turn to

## "SIFTINGS" AND "SIFTINGS SIFTED."

Brother Roberts says: "Christ came to atone for man's transgressions, and to make known to man that there is a way of salvation, and laid down the essentials, viz: Repentance, faith, baptism, keeping of the Lord's supper, washing of the saint's feet, &c. These were essential, are now, and ever will be essential to man's salvation." Dr. Miller, of this State, quotes the above, adding one "&c" and then protests, claiming that "Purity" is the only essential to man's salvation. Dr. Balsbaugh of Pennsylvania, thinks Bro. Miller's "Siftings" do not give us "the perfectly chaffless wheat;" that is, his criticism does not reach the whole truth. I am constrained to say, Truth, brother Balsbaugh, but your "Siftings Sifted" is open to the same criticism. To assume that "purity" or "holiness" is essential to man's salvation, and that "Repentance is essential, for without it holiness is impossible. So of faith. So of obedience," &c., is only a circuitous way of reiterating what brother Roberts said in the onset, and is therefore, no less objectionable. It is true that "the Grammar of God will stand," but it is not good, on that account, to ignore "Webster and Brown," or any other good authority in the use of language. But what says Brother Miller? If I am able to comprehend the use of language, he says the same thing in different words. Hear him: "Peter tells us how Gentiles were saved in his day, and says it was by God, 'purifying their hearts by faith.' So faith and repentance become previous conditions, essential to the attainment of this state of salvation, i. e. Purity; baptism, the supper, and all other duties are conditions by which that saved condition, Purity, is retained." With reference to the "essentials" enumerated by brother Roberts, brother Miller says, "Even to the adult sinner

but one of these duties is 'essential' to purity, and that is 'faith'; and this is essential because it is the only medium through which purity can be attained." In short, he says, in substance, Purity is essential to salvation; and repentance and faith are essential to the attainment of purity, and baptism, the supper, and all other duties are conditions by which it is retained. The difference is about this: Roberts says we must do certain things to be saved; Miller says to be saved we must be pure, and to get and keep pure we must do those things: and Balsbaugh says we must be holy to be saved, and holiness is not possible without doing these things. Here are distinctions without difference. Let us now endeavor to harmonize "Webster and Brown" and "God's Grammar", and see whether Roberts, Miller, and Balsbaugh do really differ or whether they agree.

1. A thing to be essential to salvation must be indispensable to the attainment of salvation; that is, salvation can, in no case, be realized without it.

2. Faith, repentance, baptism, &c., are not essential to salvation, in the absolute sense of the term; for it is attained by those who die in infancy or idiocy without either of them.

3. The Gospel of Christ is not preached to infants or idiots, but to actual sinners; and to these faith, repentance, baptism, &c., are means for the attainment and retention of purity, or holiness, and, therefore, they are conditions of salvation.

4. There is a purifying and sanctifying efficacy, but not a saving power, in these works; and they are essential to the salvation of those for whom they are intended, as the promise of salvation is connected with them.

5. As long as the sinner willfully rejects or willingly neglects salvation on the terms of the Gospel, or on the conditions specified, he is unholy and unsaved.

6. When the sinner's heart is purified by faith, his life reformed by repentance, and he is initiated into the body or church of Christ by baptism, he can claim the promises of the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit as his own.

7. If he who is adopted into the family of God, according to article sixth, continues faithful in the use of the means of grace and in the discharge of his duties as prescribed in the Gospel, he will receive a crown of life.

8. If a man is born again, enjoys a blissful Christian experience, and then falls away from his Christian life and faith, it is impossible to renew him to repentance, and he is in a more deplorable condition than he was before his conversion.

9. As a man can commit adultery in his heart when a thousand miles away from a woman, or when it is impossible to gratify his lust, so a man can be converted and keep all the ordinances of the Lord's house in his heart when a thousand miles from the church, or when it is impossible to obey the outward form according to the inward desire and purpose.

10. No man is baptized in his heart, or obeys any other ordinance or command in his heart, as long as he neglects an opportunity to perform the outward duty or service.

11. When a man has discharged his whole duty, either in his heart or overtly, he is an unprofitable servant and is saved by grace. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." 1 John 1: 7. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Acts 4: 12.

12. "He that believeth not, shall be damned." Mark 16: 16.

With reference to man's salvation and the essentiality of the means of grace, I present the foregoing twelve articles as containing a brief summary of "the Grammar of God," in plain English, in the use of words as defined by Webster and according to the laws of language as laid down by Brown. "The Grammar of God" is perfect; my synopsis, like all human efforts, is imperfect; but I submit it to the prayerful consideration of all who seek salvation and truth as found in Jesus, praying for God's blessing to accompany it.

Lathrop, Cal. Nov. 20, 1884.

We often meet with more instances of true charity among the ignorant and poor, than among those who profess to be Christians.

## SIFTINGS AGAIN.

BY J. A. MILLER, D. D., M. D.

ED. EVANGELIST—Dear Sir and Brother: As brother Balsbaugh has resifted my previous siftings, and failed to point out any "smut," designate any "cheat," or even bring to the surface any "chaff," and has undesignedly conceded all I plead for, I should have allowed his strictures to pass, but when you add an editorial note stating that, "Balsbaugh stands in defense of the Gospel. Our object in publishing Dr. Miller's article was to have it replied to by brother Balsbaugh, or some one else," &c., &c., it is representing me to your readers as attacking "the Gospel," and necessitates a "defense." Such a statement does my motive, object and act, a great injustice, and in justice to myself and readers, I must ask to be heard once for all, in my own defense, as my language, even by the utmost perversion of its use, cannot be distorted into a sustaining of your assertion.

I simply took exception to the use of the term "essential," as applied to duties and ordinances, as a condition of salvation, and this you characterize as opposing "the Gospel." And yet Christ never said these were "essential"; the Apostles never said so, the Bible never says so. In fact, unless I am greatly mistaken, the word "essential" is not found in the Bible at all. Hence, brethren who profess to have "no creed but the Bible," could certainly find Bible terms by which to express that creed. If it is opposed to "the Gospel" as taught by the Brethren, to me it is consoling to know that no successful attempt has ever been made to show it is opposed to the "Gospel" of the Son of God.

Your correspondent then started out with an apparent sarcastic sneer, at what he is pleased to style "the double doctor, J. A. Miller," etc. Such a sneer may be difficult to answer, but I apprehend your more intelligent readers will, with me, think it a poor defense of "the Gospel" of Christ. If National jurisprudence confers on honored institutions, the legal right to confer Academic or professional degrees on meritorious students, who honestly pass their curriculum, I am not convinced that it is any more disgrace to such students to modestly wear such titles, than it is to such institutions to confer them, or to others to be without them. His next statement is that this "double doctor" cannot hide his step under an authoritative diction." In earlier years I should have hurled such an insinuation back into the teeth of its originator with disdain, as beneath the contempt of Christian candor. At present I have only to say that Dr. Miller never made the attempt to "hide" under anything, much less an "authoritative diction." Hence, such an insinuation will be more cogent when it represents existing facts, instead of morbid fancies.

As to his "Grammar of God," I have nothing to say as I never heard of it before, and know of no one who has attacked it. He then adds, "Holiness is indeed the grand fundamental imperative of redemption." "Purity" is the fundamental of Redemption." "Holiness" is its completion, the crowning act, the cap-stone of the whole blood-bought superstructure; which secures to the redeemed an "abundant entrance through the gate into the city." And this purity is, and ever must be, "Zealous of good works," which we attempt to "divorce at our peril," and if so, "We, at our peril," magnify these "good works" into "essentials" to salvation. I before was not aware that "essential" was such a "critical word," or that it was so easy to "convert it into an ugly, logical club with which to batter down the very citadel of the truth as it is in Jesus;" as I never before met an instance in which it was used for such a purpose, till used by your correspondent to elevate Christian duties and ordinances into essentials to salvation. If it is deemed "dangerous to deprecate the symbolical," and it is, is it not equally dangerous to magnify "the symbolical" into "essentials" to salvation. This is the rock on which ancient Judaism foundered, and still drifting around it, are the floating fragments of their wreck and ruin. It is in fact the tendency of Catholicism, of all church and state organizations, and some who are termed orthodox, to magnify the importance of all types and shadows, forms, ceremonies and symbols, till they raise to "essentials" or even to salvation. Out here, this

charge has frequently been made against the Brethren church, when I have spoken in its favor: "They make ordinances, salutations and symbols essential to salvation;" and when a brother writing for the EVANGELIST, casually, or inadvertently used language capable of such a construction, and I ventured a correction, for this I am indirectly represented as opposing "the Gospel," and am thus forced to the conclusion that the Brethren church believe this, is "the Gospel," i. e. that these symbols are essential to salvation. If so, I have only to ask their pardon for my attempted defense. If this is not the case, then I have no objection to brother B., or anybody else creating a man of straw, and then tearing it to pieces for the amusement of your readers; but please don't ascribe its parentage to me. But, if "Idle words tend to damnation," and they do, then brethren should be cautious how they use them.

Brother B. then concedes all I claim, as he says: "This is the one essential, and to this we must all conform." To this I say: Amen; no room for controversy here. As the Master had said, "But one thing is needful," and that one thing was to sit meekly at the Master's feet and learn the lessons of his grace. "Sanctify them through thy truth." "Ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you," and not through ordinances, types, shadows or symbols, however important these may be as helpers to a higher life. But not satisfied with his admission, brother B. then adds: "Repentance is essential \* \* so of faith \* \* so of obedience," &c., &c. Let us see:

"Repentance is essential" to salvation. Infants do not repent: Therefore, infants cannot be saved. Brother B., is that Gospel? Is that in harmony with Christ when he says, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Change the major premise and supply any one of your "Essentials" and the inevitable inference is the same.

Brother, please excuse me if I say without intending an offense, that "notwithstanding" limited learning, and, perhaps few "Bible readings and" no "titles of erudition and honor, we may" just as easily "miss the truth in simple matters" as when possessed of them, and your article is a striking illustration of this possibility.

Mr. Editor, if my articles are an offense to you or your readers, I have done. Farewell.

## TOO MUCH WATER.

M. W. KIM.

A certain minister of the Gospel once said to me in my office, "You Brethren have too much water in your religion." Do you not know that the Spirit does all the work? I said, we are to try the spirits whether they are of God. "Because many false prophets are gone out into the world." Let us, then, take that Spirit that told Philip to join himself to the Ethiopian's chariot: "And he heard him read the prophet Esaias, and said, Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I except some man should guide me? And he desired Philip that he would come up and sit with him." "Then Philip opened his mouth and began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus. And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water: and the eunuch said: See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they both went down into the water, and the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip that the eunuch saw him no more." Then I asked this minister if that was the true spirit of God, but no answer came, and he immediately disappeared. The spirit of the Lord did not take Philip away until he had done his will.

Johnstown, Pa.

Many persons consider themselves friendly when they are only officious.

Religion cannot pass away. The burning of a little straw may hide the stars of the sky, but the stars are there and will re-appear.

Work of hand or head is not an end in itself, but a means of the development, progress and happiness of man.